REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-20 and 22-25 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Beaudin et al. in view of Love et al. While applicant does not believe that this combination renders obvious the claims, the independent claims have nonetheless been amended to better emphasize their patentable distinctions and to obviate any interpretations of these claims which were not intended.

As amended, Claim 1 specifies determining whether a reduced power consumption mode has been selected. In that reduced power consumption mode, all of the multiple signal inputs are used. However, in the reduced power consumption mode, a signal strength of the signal inputs are determined, a combination of multiple signal inputs are determined, and that combination of multiple signal inputs are used only (that is, without using all of the signal inputs,) for the reduced power consumption mode.

This was rejected based on Beaudin et al. in view of Love et al. Initially, applicants do not admit that Love et al. is necessarily prior art.

The scope and contents of Beaudin et al. were described above. Beaudin et al. teaches a combiner for a multiplicity of diversity signals. This receives strength indicative signals

that are indicative of strengths of the data signals. These signals are then combined. While Beaudin et al. may select some of these signals for use and some not for use, there is no teaching or suggestion of a reduced power consumption mode. According to Beaudin et al., the signals are combined whenever an additional signal provides more information. If the signal does not provide more information, then it is not combined. However, Beaudin has no teaching or suggestion of a reduced power consumption mode.

The secondary reference, Love et al., does teach a reduced power consumption mode. For example, paragraph 31 describes that there can be an idle or dormant mode. However, Love et al. clearly states that the diversity mode is disabled in the intermediate state. See paragraph 32, beginning at the fifth line. In other words, Love et al. may teach a reduced power consumption mode, but the only thing that Love et al. teaches in that reduced power consumption mode, is turning off diversity entirely.

Therefore, consider the hypothetical combination of Beaudin et al. in view of Love et al. Beaudin et al. teaches combining multiple signals as long as every additional signal provides extra information. Combine this with the teaching of Love et al. who teaches a diversity mode in which multiple signals are obtained, but also teaches turning off that diversity mode in

some power reduced modes. When that diversity mode is turned off, only a single signal is received. The hypothetical combination would therefore be a Beaudin et al. type system of combining multiple signals, combining some but not all, as in Beaudin et al., and combining an additional signal only when it adds more information; combined with Love et al.'s teaching of the power reduced mode in which the entire diversity system is turned off, that is when there is power reduction, using only a single signal.

The present application goes far beyond that, by claiming, in Claim 1, using all the signals when the reduced power consumption mode is not detected, and using multiple signals, but fewer than all of them, in the reduced power consumption mode. Unlike Love et al., which simply teaches turning off diversity and using only one signal, claim 1 provides the ability to use a high-power diversity or low-power diversity.

Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion of such multiple kinds of combining signals based on power consumption in the hypothetical combination of prior art. Claim 1 defines a significant advance: you can still use diversity, but you can use a lower power form of the diversity. The prior art does not enable this kind of operation. The prior art would enable either use diversity, or turn off the diversity entirely to save

power. The present application is a significant advance beyond that.

The dependent claims should be allowable for reasons stated above with respect to the respective independent claim.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. No fee is believed to be due, however please apply any credits or additional charges to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2007

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. **20985**
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10747242.doc